

### REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated October 19, 2006, having a shortened statutory period set to expire January 19, 2007. Proposed amendments to the Claims include amending Claims 4 and 5, cancelling Claims 7 and 9, and adding Claims 20-22. Upon entry of the proposed amendments, Claims 1, 3-6, 10, 12, 14-17 and 19-22 will now be pending.

Applicants' undersigned representative appreciates the time and courtesy extended by the Examiner during a January 18, 2007 teleconference. While no formal agreement was reached regarding the patentability of the pending claims, the Examiner's offer to conduct further telephone discussions, if warranted in the future, is greatly appreciated.

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

In paragraph 6 of the present Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 3-7, 9-10, 12, 14-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Stammers et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,096,554 – “*Stammers*”) in view of Schwabe (U.S. Patent No. 6,883,163 – “*Schwabe*”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

With reference to exemplary **Claim 1**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest “converting said Java card CAP file into a corresponding Java code file that is semantically identical to said Java card CAP file, wherein the Java card CAP file is created from an the original file contains classes that are capable of being compiled” (as supported in the present specification at page 2, lines 16-25), “and wherein the only executable instructions in the Java card CAP file are applets” (as supported on page 2, line 26 to page 3, line 8. That is, the original file includes full function files, while the CAP file only includes applets that must be executed by a browser's Java Virtual Machine (JVM). As described on page 2, line 30 to page 3, line 2, “The virtual machine itself need not load or manipulate Java card CAP files; it need only execute the applet code found in the Java card CAP file that was loaded onto the device by the installation program.”

*Stammers*, and particularly the cited passages, only deals with unpacking Java files from

a JAR file. The unpacked (i.e., unzipped) Java files have the same properties as the packed JAR file, in that both include class files. As stated in column 7, lines 37-40 of *Stammers*, “class objects only access other class objects with the same namespace. An object created by a classloader cannot be changed...” There is no teaching or suggestion of two different types of files, one being standard Java files that are capable of being compiled, while the CAP file only contains applets.

With regards to **Claim 4**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest creating “a cryptographic signature file for the Java card CAP file.” *Schwabe*, and particularly the cited passage at column 17, lines 55-67, refers to a “program verifier.” However, there is no teaching or suggestion that such a “program verifier” creates a signature file. Rather, as taught in column 4, lines 41-42, *Schwabe* refers to “verification” as “post-compilation module checking.” That is, verification is similar to debugging, in which references to different objects are checked to ensure that the nomenclature, call operations, etc. are proper (see column 4, lines 20-44 of *Schwabe*). Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion in the combination of cited art of creating a cryptographic signature file for a Java card CAP file.

With regards to **Claim 5**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest attaching the cryptographic signature file to the CAP file when loading the CAP file into a chipcard, as supported in the present specification on page 13, lines 16-17 and on page 18, lines 7-27. As noted above, *Schwabe* does not teach signature files at all, and in particular does not teach storing the signature file and CAP file together on a chipcard.

With regards to new **Claim 20**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest “converting an original file into a reduced file, wherein the original file contains a class description section and an instruction section, and wherein the reduced file contains a code description section that is based on the class description section, and wherein the reduced file contains a code section that is based on the instruction section,” as supported on page 18, lines 7-27 of the present specification, “wherein the original file contains classes that are capable of being compiled” (supported on page 2, lines 16-25), “and wherein the only executable instructions in the reduced file are applets” (supported on page 2, line 26 to page 3, line 8);

“converting the reduced file into a converted file, wherein the reduced file and the converted file are semantically identical” (supported on page 18, lines 7027); “creating a cryptographic signature for the converted file” (supported on page 18, lines 7-27); and “storing the cryptographic signature and the reduced file in a chipcard” (supported on page 18, lines 7-27), wherein the cryptographic signature verifies that the reduced file was converted by a trusted entity” (supported on page 18, lines 7-27).

With regards to new **Claim 21**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest that the standard code file is a Java™ file, and wherein the CAP file is designed to be used in a Java™ card,” as supported on page 2, line 26 to page 3, line 8 of the present specification.

### CONCLUSION

As a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest all limitations found in the presently pending claims, Applicants now respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a teleconference would be useful in promoting any or all of the present claims to allowance, such a telephone call to the Applicant's undersigned representative, at 512.617.5533, would be greatly appreciated.

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application to **IBM CORPORATION DEPOSIT ACCOUNT No. 09-0461**.

Respectfully submitted,



James E. Boice  
*Registration No. 44,545*  
DILLON & YUDELL LLP  
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway  
Suite 2110  
Austin, Texas 78759  
512.617.5533

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)